

**REMARKS**

**I. Introduction**

Claims 11 to 30 are pending in the present application. It is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Applicants note with appreciation the acknowledgement of the claim for foreign priority and the indication that all of the copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the previously filed Information Disclosure Statement, PTO-1449 paper, and cited references. With respect to the references disclosed in the prior Information Disclosure Statement, which were apparently not provided by the International Search Authority, Applicants submit herewith a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement and PTO-1449 paper, which includes previously disclosed courtesy copies of the references. Accordingly, no fees are believed to be due.

**II. Rejection of claims 11 to 30 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2**

Claims 11 to 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, as assertedly indefinite. While Applicants do not agree with the merits of this rejection, claim 11 has been amended herein without prejudice, thereby obviating the present rejection.

Claim 11 clearly refers to a system for generating an image of a region of a surface of a component, and indicates that the region of the surface emits light.

With respect to the question of what image is captured that needs to be processed if the surface emits light, the question is not understood. Indeed, that the surface emits light does not affect whether an image is to be captured.

With respect to “the additional imaging components,” there is no requirement for the claim to provide further details concerning the additional components. To the extent the claim is rejected because the term is broad, it is noted that, as § 2173.04 of the M.P.E.P., entitled “Breadth Is Not Indefiniteness,” states: “Breadth of a claim is not to be equated with indefiniteness.” *See also In re Miller*, 169 USPQ 597 (CCPA 1971). Regardless of breadth, if the scope of the subject matter embraced by the claims is clear, and if Applicants have not otherwise indicated that they intend the invention to be of a scope different from that defined in the claims, then the claims are proper. MPEP § 2173.04. A claim therefore can both be

**U.S. Pat. Appl. Ser. No. 10/583,988  
Attorney Docket No. 10191/4533  
Reply to Office Action of January 8, 2009**

broad and, at the same time, clearly demarcate to those of ordinary skill in the art the boundaries of Applicants' invention. In order to establish that these claims are too broad, *i.e.*, that the scope of invention to which Applicants are striving to attain is more than what they are entitled to under the Patent Act, specific evidence in the form of references or other publications must be brought forth by the Patent Office. Therefore, the issue of breadth is one that pertains to the outer limits of what Applicants are entitled to exclude others from making, using, or selling, limits which are bounded by what is in the public domain and also by what others have already staked out for themselves as their own property. In other words, the proper rubrics for examining the issue of breadth are those of anticipation and obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103.

In this instance, the Office Action has not identified anything unclear about the term "imaging components." Indeed, it is respectfully submitted that the term is clear and gives rise to no ambiguity with respect to the scope of the subject matter embraced by the claims.

Accordingly, the claims are clear, give rise to no ambiguity, and are therefore definite. Withdrawal of the indefiniteness rejection of claims 11 to 30 is therefore respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of pending claims 11 to 30 are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections and objections be withdrawn. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 16, 2009

By: /Aaron Grunberger/  
Aaron Grunberger, Reg. No. 59,210 for  
Gerard A. Messina (Reg. No. 35,952)

KENYON & KENYON LLP  
One Broadway  
New York, New York 10004  
(212) 425-7200

**CUSTOMER NO. 26646**